

In re Patent Application of:

**CANTONI ET AL.**

Serial No. **09/919,725**

Filed: **JULY 31, 2001**

---

**REMARKS**

Claims 15, 17-23, 25-40, 45-52, 57-59 and 64-67 remain in the application.

Claims 15, 17-23, 25-40, 45-52, 57-59 and 64-67 stand rejected.

The Examiner rejected claims 19, 20, 30-32 and 34-38 under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection.

The Examiner objected to language in claims 19, 30, 31, 34 and 38 as lacking support in the specification. As set forth more in detail hereinafter, each of the instances of language objected to by the Examiner have adequate and complete support in the specification. Specifically, the language objected to by the Examiner has support in the specification as originally filed and particularly in Figures 8 and 11 and the accompanying descriptive material.

In re Patent Application of:

**CANTONI ET AL.**

Serial No. **09/919,725**

Filed: **JULY 31, 2001**

---

With respect to claim 19 the Examiner found no support for the limitation "providing the source identifier code to a comparator in response to detection of said first code at said destination, and in response to detection of the second code associated with a subsequently received slot providing the source identifier thereof to the comparator to check for a match, and storing the message segment of the subsequently received slot in said buffer in response to detection of a match".

As shown in Figure 11, a comparator is item 72. The source identifier code is provided over the LOAD SI line to the comparator. The first code, in terms of the disclosure, is the beginning of message or BOM code.

Figure 11 is an implementation of the state machine shown in Figure 8. See column 9, lines 61-66. The operation of the state machine with respect to handling of the BOM code is discussed at column 8, lines 59-64. The processing with respect to receipt of a continuation of message (COM) code is discussed at column 9, lines 3-8. The processing with respect

In re Patent Application of:

**CANTONI ET AL.**

Serial No. **09/919,725**

Filed: **JULY 31, 2001**

---

to the last slot (end of message - EOM) is described at column 9, lines 11-15.

Returning to claim 19, when the second code (COM) associated with the subsequently received slot is received, the source identifier code is provided to comparator 72 over line 88 where it is compared with the stored SI's in comparator 72. If there is a match, the appropriate buffer will be selected depending upon the output from comparator 72 and that packet stored in the respective buffer 76.

Thus, the language of claim 19 objected to by the Examiner has complete and adequate support in the specification.

With respect to claim 30, the Examiner objected to the following language as lacking support:

"providing, to a comparator the source identifier code of the first slot received at the destination node, providing to the comparator, the source identifier code of each subsequently received slot, and storing the message segment of the subsequently received slot in the buffer in response to an occurrence of a match between the source identifier code of the first slot and

In re Patent Application of:  
**CANTONI ET AL.**  
Serial No. 09/919,725  
Filed: JULY 31, 2001

---

the source identifier code of subsequent slots"

In claim 30, the comparator referred to can be item 72 of Figure 11. the source identifier code found in the first slot is sent to the comparator over the LOAD SI line where it is stored. A subsequent source identifier code will be applied to the comparator over line 88 and if there is a match, the segment content will be applied to the buffer input over line 84 and stored in the selected buffer 76 as discussed above.

With respect to claim 31, the Examiner objects to the following languages lacking support:

"outputting a reassembled message  
from the buffer in response to detection  
of the third code"

The segments reassembled in buffer 76 are output over line 80. See Figure 8 in the discussion at column 9, lines 3-15. See also, column 10, lines 41-49 and column 10, lines 50-52. Thus the language objected to by the Examiner has full and adequate support in the specification.

In re Patent Application of:

**CANTONI ET AL.**

Serial No. **09/919,725**

Filed: **JULY 31, 2001**

---

With respect to claim 34, the Examiner objected to the following language as lacking support:

"a selector for checking the third code and for providing source identifier codes to the comparator for comparison with subsequently received source identifier codes"

The selector for checking the third code is found in the discussion of Figure 8 at columns 9, lines 3-15. The SI codes are provides over the load SI line to comparator 72. This claim language, too is fully supported by the specification.

With respect to claim 38, the Examiner objected to the following language as lacking support:

"the controller is configured to output a reassembled message from the buffer in response to detection of a third code, the reassembled message being associated with the source identifier code of the slot containing the detected third code"

The controller in which the output of the reassembly state machine of Figure 8 is implemented causes output of the reassembled message from the buffer as discussed at column 9,

In re Patent Application of:  
**CANTONI ET AL.**  
Serial No. **09/919,725**  
Filed: **JULY 31, 2001**

---

lines 3-15 and is shown in line 10(b) of Figure 8 and the associated discussion in the specification.

Thus, each of the instances of claim language determined by the Examiner to have no support in the specification is in fact supported completely and fully by the written description. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. The Examiner identified two instances of lack of antecedent basis. Each of these claims has been amended to provide appropriate antecedent basis. Although the antecedent was clear, the Examiner has taken a technical interpretation of the claim and as a result, the language has been modified only to comply with the technical nature of the rejection and to make no substantive change.

The Examiner rejected claims 15, 17, 18, 21-23, 25-29, 33, 39, 40, 45-52, 57-59 and 64-67 under 35 U.S.C § 102 as anticipated by Temple.

In re Patent Application of:  
**CANTONI ET AL.**  
Serial No. **09/919,725**  
Filed: **JULY 31, 2001**

---

By this amendment, claims 15, 26, 28, 29, 33, 39, 47, 49, 51, 52, 57, 58, 59, 64, 65, 66 and 67 have been canceled. The Examiner has indicated that claims 19, 20, 30-32 and 34-38 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome other rejections in the case.

Turning to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on the Temple reference, with respect to claims 17, 25, 45 and 46, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Temple reference of placing a destination address in the message segment of a mini packet. Accordingly, these claims are not anticipated by Temple.

Claims 23, 27, 48 and 50 each contain "means" limitations. The Examiner has not interpreted those limitations in accordance with the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. If the Examiner were to do so, the Examiner would see that these claims are not anticipated by the Temple reference either.

In re Patent Application of:

**CANTONI ET AL.**

Serial No. **09/919,725**

Filed: **JULY 31, 2001**

---

Independent claim 18 (previously dependent upon claim 15) relates to a method of transmitting or receiving. There is no teaching or suggestion in the Temple reference for storing message segments in a buffer at the transmitting end or at the receiving end as claimed in claim 18.

Claim 21 refers to a "single segment buffer" which is neither taught nor suggested in the Temple reference.

Claim 22 is dependent upon claim 20, which has been indicated by the Examiner to be drawn to allowable subject matter and is therefore allowable for the same reasons.

Thus, all of the claims remaining in the application are drawn to allowable subject matter. Each contains limitations which clearly distinguish over the Temple reference.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and permit the application to issue as a patent.




In re Patent Application of:  
**CANTONI ET AL.**  
Serial No. 09/919,725  
Filed: JULY 31, 2001

---

Should any minor informalities need to be addressed,  
the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney  
at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection  
with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 01-0484  
and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

DAVID L. STEWART  
Reg. No. 37,579  
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath  
& Gilchrist, P.A.  
255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401  
Post Office Box 3791  
Orlando, Florida 32802  
407-841-2330